

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the present amendment in the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10 and 12-28 are presently pending in this case. Claims 1, 17, 23, 27, and 28 are amended and Claim 11 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer by the present amendment. As amended Claims 1, 17, 23, 27, and 28 are supported by the original disclosure,<sup>1</sup> no new matter is added.

This amendment is submitted in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.116 which after final rejection permits entering of amendments canceling claims, complying with any requirement of form expressly set forth in a previous Office Action, or presenting rejected claims in better form for consideration on appeal. The present amendment amends the claims to include the subject matter of original Claim 11. This amendment does not raise new issues requiring further consideration and/or search. It is therefore respectfully requested that the present amendment be entered under 37 C.F.R. §1.116.

In the outstanding Official Action, Claims 1-25, 27, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Ishiguro et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20020194475, hereinafter “Ishiguro”); and Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Ishiguro in view of Akkermans et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20060104449, hereinafter “Akkermans”).

With regard to the rejection of Claims 1, 17, 23, 27, and 28 as anticipated by Ishiguro, that rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended Claim 1 recites in part:

said authenticating means provides device identification data identifying the device to be authenticated and service identification data to said key generating means, said service identification data including first service identification data

---

<sup>1</sup>See, e.g., the specification at page 21, lines 9-21 and original Claim 11.

corresponding to a first service to be received by a user of the device to be authenticated and second service identification data corresponding to a second service to be received by the user of the device to be authenticated, said key generating means selects one of said first service identification data or said second service identification data, *said key generating means selects a key generation algorithm corresponding to selected service identification data from among a plurality of different key generation algorithms*, and said key generating means generates said key data by using said selected key generation algorithm.

The outstanding Office Action cited the generation of keys sk1' and sk2' of Ishiguro as “key data” as recited in Claim 1, and cited paragraph 100 of Ishiguro as describing the subject matter of original Claim 11.<sup>2</sup> However, it is respectfully submitted that Ishiguro only describes that keys sk1' and sk2' are produced with a *single* algorithm, identified as “Dec” in paragraph 105 of Ishiguro. Further, paragraph 100 of Ishiguro simply describes that license key lk1 is computed using a single hash function “hash.” Ishiguro does not appear to describe anywhere a *plurality* of different key generation algorithms, much less a key generating means that *selects* a key generation algorithm corresponding to selected service identification data. Therefore, Ishiguro does not teach “key generating means” as defined in amended Claim 1. Consequently, Claim 1 (and Claims 2-16 dependent therefrom) is not anticipated by Ishiguro and is patentable thereover.

Amended Claims 17 and 23 recite in part “said generating including *selecting a key generation algorithm corresponding to selected service identification data from among a plurality of different key generation algorithms*, and said generating including generating said key data by using said selected key generation algorithm.”

As noted above, Ishiguro does not appear to describe anywhere a plurality of different key generation algorithms, much less selecting a key generation algorithm corresponding to selected service identification data. Therefore, Ishiguro does not teach “generating” as

---

<sup>2</sup>See page outstanding Office Action at page 2, lines 20-22 and page 4, lines 13-15.

defined in amended Claims 17 and 23. Consequently, Claims 17 and 23 (and Claims 18-22 and 24-26 dependent therefrom) are not anticipated by Ishiguro and are patentable thereover.

Amended Claim 27 recites in part:

*said key generating circuit selects a key generation algorithm corresponding to selected service identification data from among a plurality of different key generation algorithms, and said key generating circuit generates said key data by using said selected key generation algorithm.*

Again, Ishiguro does not appear to describe anywhere a plurality of different key generation algorithms, much less a key generating circuit that selects a key generation algorithm corresponding to selected service identification data. Therefore, Ishiguro does not teach “a key generating circuit” as defined in amended Claim 27. Consequently, Claim 27 is not anticipated by Ishiguro and is patentable thereover.

Amended Claim 28 recites in part:

*said key generating unit is configured to select a key generation algorithm corresponding to selected service identification data from among a plurality of different key generation algorithms, and said key generating unit is configured to generate a said key data by using said selected key generation algorithm.*

Ishiguro does not appear to describe anywhere a plurality of different key generation algorithms, much less a key generating unit configured to select a key generation algorithm corresponding to selected service identification data. Therefore, Ishiguro does not teach “a key generating unit” as defined in amended Claim 28. Consequently, amended Claim 28 is not anticipated by Ishiguro and is patentable thereover.

With regard to the rejection of Claim 26 as unpatentable over Ishiguro in view of Akkermans, it is noted that Claim 26 is dependent from Claim 23, and thus are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above. Further, it is respectfully submitted that Akkermans does not cure any of the above-noted deficiencies of Ishiguro. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 26 is patentable over Ishiguro in view of Akkermans.

Application No. 10/791,760  
Reply to Office Action of June 9, 2008

Accordingly, the pending claims are believed to be in condition for formal allowance.

An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)

I:\ATTY\ET\249943US\249943US-AMD9.9.08.DOC

*Edward Tracy*

Bradley D. Lytle  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40,073  
Edward W. Tracy, Jr.  
Registration No. 47,998